DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 394 417 HE 029 111

AUTHOR Diamond, C. T. Patrick; Mullen, Carol A.
TITLE Beyond the Mentor-Mentee Arrangement. Co-authoring Forms of Post-Mentorship.
PUB DATE Apr 96
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, April 8-13, 1996).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Collegiality; Graduate Students; Higher Education; Interpersonal Relationship; *Interprofessional Relationship; *Mentors; Professional Development; *Teacher Student Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Protege Mentor Relationship

ABSTRACT

Two professors provide a duography of their former faculty-student relationship that confronted existing mentoring practices. They explore duography as an arts-based form of qualitative research to extend ways of thinking about and practicing the mentorship of graduate students. Duography is defined as a retrospective written account that two people provide of selected events or ideas taken from their lives. The authors trace their mentor-dissertation candidate relationship as it evolved from a mentor-mentee relationship to a co-authoring form of post-mentorship in which the participants listen to each other's visual voice and imagery. The authors found that mentorship can evolve into partnership by taking turns in leading conceptualizing, writing, and presenting; they suggest that the development of graduate students as emerging researchers may be promoted through the use of duography as joint inquiry. (Contains 62 references.) (Author/NAV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 394 417

Beyond the Mentor-Mentee Arrangement:

Co-authoring Forms of Post-mentorship

C. T. Patrick Diamond and Carol A. Mullen

The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT)

and, Texas A&M University (TAMU)

HE 029 111

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C.T. Patrick Diamond

Carol A. Mullen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Beyond the Mentor-Mentee Arrangement:

Co-authoring Forms of Post-mentorship

Beyond the Mentor-Mentee Arrangement:

Co-authoring Forms of Post-mentorship

C. T. Patrick Diamond and Carol A. Mullen

Institutional Affiliations and Mailing Addresses

C. T. Patrick Diamond

Professor

The Joint Center for Teacher Development (10th floor)

The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of th University of Toronto

252 Bloor Street West

Toronto, Ontario M5S 1V6 Canada

Residence Number: (416) 944-0792

Office Number: (416) 923-6641, extension 2629

Office FAX Number: (416) 926-4754

Carol A. Mullen

Assistant Professor

College of Education

Department of Educational Curriculum and Instruction

Texas A & M University

College Station, Texas 77843-4232

Residence Number: (409) 696-0681

Office Number: (409) 845-6436

Office Fax Number: (409) 845-9663

E-mail address: cmullen@acs.tamu.edu

Beyond the Mentor-Mentee Arrangement:

Co-authoring Forms of Post-mentorship

Biographies

C. T. Patrick Diamond is a professor and dissertation supervisor of arts-based educational research at the Joint Center for Teacher Development (JCTD) of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT), Canada. He is Acting Director of the JCTD and an associate editor for Curriculum Inquiry.

Carol A. Mullen is an Assistant Professor using arts-based methods of instruction and research in the Department of Educational Curriculum and Instruction (EDCI) at Texas A&M University (TAMU). She is Principal Investigator of a study exploring Hispanic preservice teachers' expressions of cultural self-identity.

Beyond the Mentor-Mentee Arrangement:

Co-authoring Forms of Post-mentorship

Abstract

We are two professors at different universities who at one time shared a mentor-mentee relationship. We explore duography as an arts-based form of qualitative research to extend ways of thinking about and practicing the mentorship of graduate students. Having become "intellectual friends", we now seek to understand our experiences of post-mentorship as co-authorship. In a duography of our partnership formed for blending and elaborating our individual and shared stories of research, we draw upon a portfolio of our writing. We define duography as a retrospective written account that two people provide of a selection of events or ideas taken from their lives. Using aesthetic design elements in the interpretation involves telling one's own research stories and also trying to understand the meanings of another's experiences. We take turns in duographic artistic representations of negotiating the interpersonal processes of authoring and responding. We leave the "swamp" by jointly authoring our account, seeking also to regain the "high, hard ground". We theorize post-mentorship as a written conversation, a doubling of individual voices.

Beyond the Mentor-Mentee Arrangement:

Co-authoring Forms of Post-mentorship

Introduction

We are two professors at different universities who at one time shared a mentor-mentee relationship. We present this paper in the dual form of an experiential account of, and as an argued accounting for, our collaborative arts-based research. Personal writing engages an individual in an internal dialogue between experience and understanding, making knowledge explicit. Duography makes the same processes explicit, but between two persons. We intend to extend our ways of thinking about and practicing an arts-based form of qualitative research. Having become "intellectual friends", we now use the arts-based perspective afforded by a duography to reflect on an alternative form of mentorship of graduate students. We trace our mentor-dissertation candidate relationship as it evolved from traditional arrangements to a co-authoring form of post-mentorship. We prefer the term "mentor" to that of "supervisor" because more than a dissertation needs to be completed if graduate student-researchers are to become faculty members.

Braque's (1993) use of a mountaineering image to reflect on his artistic relationship with Picasso captures qualities of what we have experienced: "The things [we] said to one another during those years will never be said again, and even if they were, no one would understand them anymore. It was like being roped together on a mountain" (p. 8:11). In this paper we ask: "What is our experience of using duography as an alternative, arts-based form of post-mentorship within existing academic practices?" We use "we" to acknowledge that our separate voices are often, but not always, in harmony. We are both authors (listed alphabetically) of this duography and acknowledge that our contributions to it are equal, though different. Where an experience clearly belongs to only one of us, we use "Patrick" or "Carol". While our research interests, professional agendas, and continuing development are shared, they are not finally merged.

Forms and Features of Arts-Based Educational Research

We define artistic research as "the choice and use of a particular medium to give ordered expression to internal imagery, feelings, and ideas that are in some way unique" (Sarason, 1990, p. 1) and that further an inquiry. At first sight, the term "arts-based research" may seem either an unnecessary, paradoxical knot or the latest candidate for relegation to jargon status. Upon further reflection, artistic research can be seen as a form of qualitative inquiry which consists of "a congeries of methods . . . whose purpose is the collection of holistic worldviews, intact belief systems, and complex inner psychic and interpersonal states" (Lincoln, 1990, p. 508). Through the use of these forms we can promote inquiry into artistic experience, meaning, and understanding. Such research also prevents our personal and shared meanings being over-run by the one-track, "objective and dispassionate" voice of science.

Artistic meaning requires artistic forms of thought and artistically treated forms that address the significance of artistic research (Eisner, 1993). These forms include a variety of qualitative methods: narrative inquiry (Connelly & Clandinin, 1988, 1990), autobiography (Grumet, 1990), autoethnography (Diamond, 1992; Pope & Denicolo, 1993), collaborative reflective inquiry (Feuerverger & Mullen, 1995), the narrative of self (Diamond, 1993, 1995), short story (Barone, 1983, 1993), visual-cinematic (Denzin, 1992), generative metaphor (Mullen & Dalton, in press); and poetic (Richardson, 1992) treatments. In a pioneering conceptualization, Barone and Eisner (1995) map the aesthetic qualities or design elements that need to infuse such an inquiry and its writing phases. These include: virtual reality, ambiguity, expressive language, contextualized and vernacular language, empathy, the personal signature of the researcher/writer, and aesthetic form. The more pronounced that these features are, the more the research may be characterized as arts-based. However, artistic researchers seek to complete an inquiry, not a work of art.

As genre analysis reveals, quantitative inquiry relies on a single form of text for its reports, consisting of introduction, method, results, and discussion (IMRD) (Swales, 1990). Although arts-based research representations are much more varied, most of them still resemble the story

with its three phases: a framing of the dilemma in which the protagonist finds him or herself; a further complication of this perplexing challenge; and a final resolution through which the main character appears to have grown or changed.

In this paper, we provide a duography of our experiences of a former faculty-student relationship that confronted existing mentoring practices. Through sharing our different forms of writing and presenting conference papers together, we constructed a form of post-mentoring that resembles a co-authoring friendship. To author our duography we draw upon a number of sources derived from our writing and conversation. These include: academic papers and chapters, self-narratives, course papers, research fieldnotes, journal entries, dreams, letters and correspondence, morning notes, poems, visuals, patterning images, and works in progress. We use this portfolio of sources to reflect on our individual and shared constructions of research. In the next section, we define duography as a form of arts-based research which is related to conceptual breakthroughs, (auto)biography, dreams, and dialogue journalling.

What is Duography?

As Eisner (1993) argues, "how we think is influenced by what we think about and how we chose or are expected to represent its content" (p. 7). Aesthetic forms need to be exploited so that artistic meanings can be constructed that might otherwise elude us. Creative insights can result when an inquirer "uncovers, selects, re-shuffles, combines, synthesizes already existing . . . ideas, faculties, skills [and perspectives]. The more familiar the parts, the more striking the new whole" (Koestler, 1964, p. 120). We use duography as a co-authored form of research to seek such artistically creative insights, promoting our reflective study of self and trusted other. We share this paper in the form, and as an effect, of "duography" (Gergen & Gergen, 1993).

We define duography as a retrospective written (graphia) account that two people provide of a selection of events or ideas taken from their lives. Aesthetic design elements help provide the interpretation. Like an autobiography, a duography involves telling one's own stories. Like a biography, a duography also involves trying to understand and articulate the experiences of

another person. Unlike an autobiography or a biography, a duography, like a duologue, features turn-taking in statement and response.

A duography is a form of inquiry in which two separate, experiencing individuals (a faculty member and a former graduate student, in this instance) reflect on their lived experience. Their separate selves expand through reflecting, writing, and responding to encompass a double self. Each self or personal author then acts as a knowing participant in the other's professional life. Through conversation, co-writing, and playing off generative metaphors, we participate in each other's attempt to understand and practice arts-based educational research. We assist by accepting and responding to each other's ideas, feelings, and expressions. Through our joint case study account, we provide each other with a hermeneutic helper (Grumet, 1990), forging new combinations.

We refer to dreams (see Carol's account in the following subsection) because they exemplify how images when re-experienced provide powerful sources of insight. Koestler (1964) relays how one of Poincare's conceptual breakthroughs occurred in a waking dream: "Ideas arose in crowds: I felt them collide until pairs interlocked, so to speak, making a stable combination" (pp. 115-116). Not only mathematicians and scientists can derive inspiration from the "roping together" of apparent opposites. Faculty and students can also recombine intuition and images, and their separate perspectives to further their inquiries. More complex thinking begins with the unexpected unification of scattered impressions (see Kozulin's biography of Vygotsky's ideas, 1990). In duography, significant features are first singled out from the concrete experience in which they are embedded and then organized into new groupings. Because the processes of thought become themselves in the medium of language, duography is well suited to providing and provoking accounts of intellectual formation.

As Keating's (1996) dissertation shows, journal writing is widely established as a means of reflecting on the development of a life of ideas. Lindberg (1987) and Voss (1988) propose that all learners need to engage in personal dialogue within self-reflective journals. A double-entry journal provides a record in parallel columns of both what is learned and how it is learned. The

related form of the dialectic notebook is particularly useful in learning how to inquire. Meanings can then be reviewed in order to see further what they suggest (Berthoff, 1987). While not all journalling approaches are interpersonal in the sense of sharing the writing and reflections with others, there are benefits when they do. For example, "as teachers develop trust and self-acceptance, they become more open and questioning of their experience" (Holly, 1989, p. 7). A dialogue journal extends the use of a self-reflective journal to include mutual reflection and collaborative sharing.

Fishman and Raver (1989) used a dialogue journal between a teacher mentor and a teacher candidate to further the exchange of their views and to document the progress of the latter. The student teacher's journal was shared but the mentor's was not. The result was a kind of one-sided written conversation. As a faculty member, Oberg (1990) used self-reflective journals with experienced teachers to record and share their daily practice and reflection. By response journalling, she acted as their co-inquirer and as her own. Whether the writing be in the form of learning logs, daybooks, thinkbooks, field notebooks, (dream) journals, or diaries, we learn more about things by writing and talking about them, especially with others. Knowledge arises from dialogue involving written interaction between a mentor and protégé as they address an area of concern such as, in our case, arts-based research.

We prepared our duography as a more communal and interwoven text, sharing our writing as we adapted the various methods of learning about our development. Duography provides both partners with a double entry form for capturing, reflecting on, and reconstructing experience. It helps in a number of ways: in creating, representing, and inventing ways of knowing; in initiating the student into the scholarly community and furthering the reflections of the mentor; and in even empowering both partners. Duography empowers co-inquirers by allowing them to shape, better understand, and so revise their experience. They then come to affect, rather than being merely affected by, events. A duography is emancipatory not only for knowledge and development but also for release from previously restricting roles and relationships.

From Mentoring to Post-mentorship

In Greek mythology, the wandering father, Ulysses, placed his son in the care of Mentor, the tutor. In Tennyson's poem, this delegation of authority may seem convenient for the largely absent father. He is content for his son to lead a life that does not interfere with his own. The need for an arts-based form of duography is confirmed by the "horror" stories in higher education that relay the neglect of traditional mentoring to emphasize relationship or collaborative inquiry. For many candidates, the dissertation experience is shot through with conflicts arising out of power plays and cross-purposes. Their "weaker" voices may be at risk of being ignored or subverted. Even though faculty may claim to exist in "symbiotic relationship" with their graduate-students, the mentors may still "consider themselves superior to [them] . . . in terms of understanding issues, problems, and courses of action, and in intellectual leadership" (Sarason, 1990, p. 66). The powerful locate themselves on "the high, hard ground" (Schon, 1987) of research sometimes to appropriate and displace the purposes of others.

The educational literature also offers empathetic accounts of the mentor-dissertation student relationship, including How to Get a Ph.D.: A Handbook for Students and Dissertation Supervisors (Phillips & Pugh, 1994) and Achieving a Ph.D.—Ten Students' Experiences (Salmon, 1992). These studies reveal the dynamics between mentor and dissertation student, and suggest new directions for professional development. Doctoral candidates are encouraged to share their research stories and to "manage upwards", learning to educate their supervisors. Academic mentoring has sometimes been based on rejecting both the mentor's previously unhappy dissertation journey and the development of a subsequent teaching style that may have been flawed and counter-productive for his or her future students (Miezitis, 1994). More positively, we have found that arts-based forms, quality relationship, and mutual development can inspire and even characterize a new form of mentoring relationship.

For the past six years, we have participated in efforts to search for a collaborative form in which not only to talk about but also to enact arts-based research. We found that mentorship can evolve into partnership through taking turns to lead in conceptualizing, writing, and presenting.

The development of graduate students as emerging researchers may be powerfully promoted through the use of duography as joint inquiry. This seems so different and so seldom detailed an approach in academe that we suggest the term, "post-mentorship", be applied to it. In the following subsection, we refer to previous and current examples of post-mentorship. However, each partnership is uniquely situated and configured: "While it might be possible to say a rose is a rose is a rose, one cannot conclude that a partnership is a partnership is a partnership" (Clark, 1988, p. 41). Each is different, bearing a distinctive mix of signatures.

William James was noted for conveying his personal involvement in ideas with zest and for treating his students as intellectual equals engaged in a common quest for knowledge. He sought to provide Mary Whiton Calkins, a member of college faculty, with "post-graduate and professional instruction" (Calkins, 1930, p. 31). They studied together "quite literally at either side of a library fire." Calkins, empowering herself to teach her teacher, became a valued collaborator. Although she completed a brilliant doctoral study of the paired associates technique she was never awarded the degree. She went on to develop one of the most influential, psychological theories of the self. Calkins was the first woman to be elected as president of the American Psychological Association.

Barone and Eisner (1995), Connelly and Clandinin (1988, 1990), and Finley and Knowles (1995) represent successful co-authorship which includes former mentors and students. Productive partnership cannot be mandated but must be left free to grow—or not. While each arrangement is differently configured, they are all aesthetically oriented. Together, these examples of post-mentoring and shared research agendas represent experimentation with conversational and dialogic formats, analytical and artistic approaches to autobiographical, biographical, and narrative inquiry, and the use of self- and other-study techniques. Each example shows how either partner can be both inside and outside the narrative of research, present to the self and to the other. Duography may not suit the purposes of all qualitative researchers.

Like some post-mentoring collaborators, Bateson and Bateson (1987) do not study their own association <u>per se</u> but rather construct a dialogue to exchange ideas. Yet, they are still

conscious of being in a special relationship. Gregory Bateson's death left Mary Catherine with an unfinished manuscript to complete. In Angels Fear: Towards an Epistemology of the Sacred, Bateson and Bateson (1987) fictionalize their relationship as "father" and "daughter" while also documenting it. Because their conversational space is symmetrically balanced, a post-mentoring frame is implied in this father-daughter textual representation. They call their form of dialogue "metalogues."

The daughter questions her father's thinking. Her responses reveal a grappling with ideas rather than any polite acceptance of them. Both engage in debate: The father views his stories as vehicles to reveal his ideas about relationships, not himself. The daughter, on the other hand, views stories as also illustrating facets of their relationship. Readers are left with this multiple presentation of meaning as an effect of storytelling and intertextuality. The Batesons did not feel the need to assimilate, complement, or to reject the other's position. Their voices freely engage in continuous or unfinished dialogue, even after the father's death.

In this following subsection, we seek to create a textual conversation among our separate accounts of the "father". We had spoken and written to each about this topic in the contexts of mentoring, self-study, and inquiry. Patrick had revisited his self-narratives (Diamond, 1993, 1995) with respect to the role of authority exercised by some mentors and members of search, tenure and promotion, and editorial committees. In Patrick's stories, he valorizes himself as a resourceful and self-reliant learner, making the best of apparent indifference or adversity. Details in the stories ironically express and confirm his narrative identity at that time. These self-analytic stories gain added coherence from secret and cultural tales of exclusion. As an only child, he had struggled to challenge the authority of a difficult parent. As an academic, he felt, like others before him, "pushed out of Australia by family circumstances, the experience of discrimination, frustration with the culture" (Conway, 1994, p. 250). He traveled overseas to find post-mentors (James Britton and Don Bannister) until he could "father" himself and others. His romantic but self-serving quest was to expel the academic gatekeepers, over-turning "the words of the fathers".

In his first narrative of self (Diamond, 1993), Patrick had written a letter of advice in his third person, academic voice to his personal self. He realized that, all too well, he had internalized the tones of some academic editors. He was persuaded to remove from that text a poem that he had written in memory of a close friend who had died suddenly. An awareness of death which was so personally painful had no place in academic publishing. Patrick learned from Carol that feminists such as Spender (1981) and Grumet (1987) had previously written critiques of such exclusions. Smith (1978) describes gatekeepers as the "people who set the standards, produce the social knowledge, monitor what is admitted to the systems of distribution, and decree the innovations in thought, or knowledge, or values" (p. 287). The time has passed when privileged authorities can routinely exclude the experiences of others.

By turning to our own practice we avoided the problems of seeming to ignore or exploit the meanings of others. We wrote together in the belief that we could assert and subvert authority, even our own. Carol had written to Patrick about the "fathers" (in her childhood and in academe) who propelled her inquiry in certain directions but blocked it in others, both within the jail and academe. As Conway (1994) had found 20 years before her as the first female Vice-President at the same university, Carol found that some mentors remained "believers in hierarchy, embodying the concern for bureaucratic procedure which had been the bane of the old British Empire in its waning years" (p. 209).

What is also a feature of Carol's research story is that, on waking, she scribbles down a remembered version of her dreams. She ponders the unforgettable dream "for the rest of the day and for days and months and years to come" (Mullen, 1994b, p. 255). In one of her dreams, she puzzles over the meanings of gatekeepers. She scrutinizes the enigmatic handwriting of an authoritative figure in an incarcerated setting. She feels confused and weakened by her effort to make desperate sense of the authority figure's cryptic message. Her own handwriting is devalued; it does not even register as significant. Carol's only role as a daughter-protégée in a version of the world such as this is to accept the gatekeeper's meaning. She conforms, but ceases to exist. She

asks: "Is my self-authoring being controlled by an author/ity or am I authoring my own fate?" This raises the issue of authoritative discourse as belonging only to the father:

> The authoritative word demands that we acknowledge it, that we make it our own; it binds us, quite independent of any power it might have to persuade us internally; we encounter it with its authority already fused to it. The authoritative word is located in a distanced zone, organically connected with a past that is felt to be hierarchically higher. It is, so to speak, the word of the fathers (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 342).

Such discourse seeks to withdraw beyond dialogue, claiming the status of taboo. Some mentoring arrangements may also seem like uncrossable boundaries between "father" and "child."

Such asymmetry could be addressed by the mentor and dissertation student's sharing and so reforming their stories of the experience. These exchanges can be fraught with interpersonal problems, institutional pressures, and a power differential which can affect the productivity, creativity, and emotional well-being of students (Phillips & Pugh, 1994; Salmon, 1992). Even when positive arrangements are experienced, they still may exclude the possibility of co-authorship. Except in extreme situations, there exists no formal context or mechanisms for investigating the relationship itself.

Our alternative approach to traditional mentorship is located within co-authoring practices. We seek to entertain the interplay of our voices as an ongoing, multi-track conversation rather than as a series of monologic exchanges. We initially wrote together to develop terms and a language for conducting educational research from the margins rather than the mainstream of accepted practice. We sought to narrate and theorize subjugated and dominant knowledge (Mullen, 1994a; Mullen & Diamond, 1995) through first exchanging our research stories. We then focused on our experiences of metaphorical and actual confinement within academe (Patrick and Carol) and jail (Carol's educational research site). We courted non-conformity as we attempted to "break out" of the claustrophobia that overshadows less qualitative styles of inquiry.

Through our artistic work, we are improvising with a form of research that enhances self-knowledge within the resonating context of collaboration. Through sharing our self-study explorations we catch our reflections in the other's understandings of how we each frame and exhibit those qualities in forms of expression which are central to our work. To speak authentically of self and other, we use the familiar techniques of representing and reinterpreting meaning, embedding conversational exchanges, and interweaving our texts as in the next section. But even these levels of co-construction are not enough. Through duography, we are brought into closer contact with our separate stories. The other then helps gauge their authenticity and persuasiveness.

Without collaborative work, the quality of the academic relationship may suffer and the success of one partner may be won at the expense of the other. We pursue arts-based duography to renew self and other. We also aim to transform educational research practices by using artistic ways of knowing to challenge dominant academic knowledge. Our challenge exists in critical, reflexive relation to our field and to the practices of others. We link arts-based research, an approach which enhances the recognition and integration of multiple stories, to co-authorship.

Our duography illustrates how we talk and write together. We approach it as a qualitative inquiry into our artistic processes and methods, and into the connected experiences of others. Because positivist paradigms continue to compete with constructivist paradigms (Guba & Lincoln, 1994), we seek to promote an alternative model of collaborative production. We redefine educational research and professional practice to include enacting and representing artistic processes and methods of research.

Our Duography of Arts-Based Mentorship

In this section, we show how we have worked on our duography and some of the results. We believe that duography is both a method and a written product or text. Such aesthetic activity is the expression of a relationship, not isolation. We further believe that the development of the mentor's self-narrative is an important first step towards forming a more dialogical mentorship. Through duography, the mentor and the student are engaged in reflexive self- and other-study.

The study of the self advances that of the other; conversely, the study of the other advances that of the self. There is a simultaneous interplay of individual and shared purposes. The challenge for each is not to co-opt the other's voice but to work towards an interdependent consciousness.

We are trying to shape our text through entering into each other's meanings, bringing a shared context and experiential account to bear on it. We have participated in artistic writing programs that consist of a series of separate and co-authoring encounters. As above, Patrick had written a series of self-critiquing texts using an ironic perspective to provide a case study of his evolving research meanings (Diamond, 1993). Patrick has also written a research story of his student-supervisor-mentor-post-mentor experiences in the form of a conceptual travelogue. He portrayed his journeying first as a tourist, then as a traveler, and finally as a guide. He had to learn to "speak in [his] own voice and not to sacrifice [his] intentions to those of others" (Diamond, 1994, p. 56). As a guide, he believes in encouraging doctoral candidates also to experience the "dissertation as a journey leading to . . . transformation" (p. 59). As a central part of her research story, Carol documented the dramatic impact of mentorship on her master's and doctoral research. This form of encounter can be experienced as an exercise in power and conformity but it can also be transformed through self-study research. Carol kept numerous kinds of journals, including one for her dreams. She concluded that graduate students experience themselves as "legitimate . . . and their life experiences as worthy and noble subjects of educational inquiry . . . as [they find] ways to write themselves into their research" (Mullen, 1994b, pp. 260-261).

Our shared "architectonics" (Bakhtin, 1990), or what we might call the study of the structure of our relationship, began six years ago. Our contact had been made by letter writing between Australia and Canada. Patrick had been appointed at his request as a visiting professor to the Center where Carol happened to be a research officer. "Used to Australian bureaucratic ways, in which such a request would have required written statements in triplicate for scrutiny by academic committees, registrars, and an academic senate" (Conway, 1994, p. 11), Patrick enjoyed the welcoming spirit of the Center. Its Director had asked Carol to invite Patrick to be part of a

speakers' seminar series that she was organizing. Beyond the usual courtesies, we did not feel overly weighted down by formal prescriptions and expectations. We quickly felt at ease with each other and set out to discover further points of contact in our research. We asked for copies of each other's writing and provided feedback.

Through turn-taking in sharing stories and texts, we expanded our mutual research interests. Patrick's understanding of narrative was then connected to Kelly's (1955) theory of personal constructs. When he arrived in 1990, Carol began interpreting him first as a scholar, then as a mentor. We enjoyed course contact which developed into a non-traditional, dissertation, and post-mentoring relationship. We did not realize that our individual practices as educational artists would continue to take new shape through our collaborative inquiries. Carol's notion of narrative was then related to studying the mythological identity formation of teachers and researchers. We have since come to understand narrative as a form of aesthetic and jointly reconstructed inquiry.

Either one of us takes the initiative in shaping future writing projects and developing research opportunities. We pool our suggestions and make plans, negotiating space and time for work. We schedule the writing in terms of what is best for the other and what is manageable for the self. We continue to articulate each other's emerging themes, extending our partially developed combinations of ideas. We develop arts-based forms, pursuing key metaphors and promising leads. We become each other's conceptual inmate and probing editor. During the collaborative phases of our text production, reconstruction, and revision, we feel that we are in our research space or "art studio" (Mullen & Knowles, 1995). We also are "in studio" during the conversational "interviews" that characterize our beginnings and endings. When one of us devises a proposal for writing or research, the other searches for a more satisfying articulation of the ideas expressed in it. While we do not write side-by-side, we re-plot and keep track of our developing ideas. We keep our drafts circulating across each other's desk through electronic mail, FAX machines, and computer disks which arrive in the mail. Although now long distance from one another, we continue to write and communicate almost daily. When we are trying out new

thinking and writing, we revisit previously developed texts and even discarded fragments. We reflect on each other's discourse and offer new perspectives, casting "sidelong glances" at the anticipated response (Dentith, 1995, p. 159).

Now that we correspond as co-participating professors countries apart, we realize that our research relationship grew through our being "roped together," first by chance but then by choice. When we began as mentor and student, development seemed to follow naturally from our relationship. Grounded in co-authorship and in self as self-other, we have created over time a program of qualitative research that emphasizes experience and scholarly co-participation. We seek to respond to the question, "What 'voice' is mirrored in the inquirer's activities, especially those directed at change?" (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 115), by studying how to represent arts-based ideas and activities using duography. We transformed our dissertation relationship through the aesthetic and political activities of writing, presenting, and publishing together. As we study our dual voice of authorship, we also address the voice of authority. Images of control and surveillance are part of our mythology of resisting gatekeeping. Rather than giving up on power, we look to become empowered, helping each other to feel powerful in ways that further individual growth and partnership.

Reflections on our experiences of research relationship may suggest some of the promising features of duography as an arts-based form of mentoring. Acceptance and constructive feedback are important to co-authorship. Taking turns to provide sensitive and shaping responses is a "learned art" involving "constant attention to details and context, and . . . active inquiry in practice as well as reflection on reconstructed accounts of practice" (Kilbourn, 1990, p. 2). As co-participants, we share conceptual and practical responsibility. We both help to provide a caring context in which even points of conflict can be raised.

Arts-based mentorship has the potential to help re-educate both research partners. University structures have a long history of excluding and marginalizing female graduate students (Calkins, 1930; Caplan, 1994). Traditionally, mentoring has involved men in relation who, as gatekeepers, prepared one another as their successors (Hall, 1983). Given this legacy, we

recognize that mentoring needs to be more inclusive, promoting creativity rather than perpetuating being "boxed in by . . . gender-biased classification schemes" (Conway, 1994, p. 223). While our relationship exists in tension with systemic realities and a sometimes harsh publication landscape (Spender, 1981), we share in generating text, decision-making, and goal-setting. We encourage each other during times of disappointment or overload. We also know when to "cut rope" from the other and to respect personal space.

We represent traditional mentorship through the image of confinement in a box. We are trying to free ourselves, using duography as a spring to release the new work of partnership. Using the energy of artistic imagination, we seek to launch ourselves out of eclipse. We adapted our poem, "'C' is for confinement and creativity," from Prince's (1993) paradigm parable:

"C" goes to school
and learns that everything comes in boxes.
"C" goes to university and graduates
only to work in another box.
One day "C" finds a spring,
releasing creativity.
"C" is launched out of confinement.
The box of "this is a mentor,"
and "this is a dissertation student,"
slowly opens.
Crumpled wings touch,
each launching the other.

Clandinin and Webb (1995)'s own response poetry documents their doubling of voice as dissertation supervisor and graduate student. They write together about relationship, beginnings, personal issues and struggles, and hierarchical encounters within graduate education. Like us, they seek a new form of mentorship. We create joint and parallel research stories (Mullen & Diamond, 1995) of experience to re-make the traditional script of mentorship.

To better understand our extended experience of collaboration we sustain the climbing image with which we began this paper. When we were first at the bottom of our ascent, we functioned as a visiting (and then as a course) professor and student; we moved towards the staging ground of becoming supervisor (then mentor) and dissertation candidate; then we climbed to the slopes of our beginning research partnership; and finally we "roped" our way toward one of the many towering summits of co-authorship. But straining towards the high ground is not without risk. There may be lingering resistance to qualitative inquiry within the broader educational research community. If some candidates remain ABD ("all but dissertation") and others untenured, their public spectacle may serve as a powerful warning to others. Hemingway (1987) begins his short story, The Snows of Kilimanjaro, with ominous restraint: "Close to the western summit there is the dried and frozen carcass of a leopard. No one knows has explained what the leopard was seeking at that altitude" (p. 39).

Theorizing Arts-Based Post-Mentorship

We work to overcome the established "built-in academic inequalities" (Salmon, 1992, p. 95) that invest the research relationship with differences in authorial voice. On the heights of professional practice, "manageable problems lend themselves to solution through application of research-based theory and technique. In the swampy lowland, messy, confusing problems defy technical solution" (Schon, 1987, p. 3). The irony is that the problems of the high ground may be comparatively unimportant, while the problems of greatest concern lie within the swamp. We use arts-based approaches to represent our individual and shared experiences of the messiness of practice. We also use arts-based approaches to reclaim the high ground by theorizing about the messiness of practice.

We have considered how our arts-based research grew out of a traditional academic context. We are developing an arts-based framework, using the imagery of climbing, in addition to that of appropriated and cited poems. Our duography is written for the purpose of blending and elaborating our individual and shared research stories. We visualize ourselves as "roped" together and to emerging possibility. Patrick's patterning image of the emerging butterfly in his

writing is transformed into that of an expressive inmate in Carol's writing. We both represent ourselves as captives struggling to escape. Like the butterfly that hatches out gradually, the mentor and student can use duography to emerge as new artistic selves.

We next consider another arts-based or Bakhtinian (1981, 1990) conceptualization to theorize further post-mentorship and educational research. Because of its possibly intimidating nature, some researchers may be tempted, as we were, to dismiss arts-based approaches in general, and Bakhtin's treatment of aesthetic activity in particular, as a form of impenetrable postmodernism. Arts-based approaches may appear as too strident or idealistic because of the need either to justify alternative modes of inquiry or to provide models of what might be. However, because these approaches are so rarely enacted and then documented to provide a record of how they function for individuals or collaborators, they are worth consideration.

As we found, part of the difficulty in pursuing a Bakhtinian interpretation may relate to his unsystematic, ambiguous writing (Dentith, 1995). But we also prefer to work by suggestion and by the accumulation of material which is repeated in different contexts. The key to a duography is the developing self-other, or author-respondent relationship. We also respect the plot of each other's stories and construct cross-references within our individual research sites (academe and prison) and self-portraits. We reflect on our re-shaped experience, allowing our enlarged meanings to emerge gradually through joint reflection. We see our developing relationship as a place and space for studying duographic or double-voiced forms of discourse.

Duography is authentic insofar as it represents an engagement in which the discourse of self and of other is interpenetrated. Bakhtin's (1981) construct of polyphony refers to an at least double-voiced discourse which has a responsive orientation to another's expression. Such an egalitarian form serves two inquirers as they take turns, expressing different sets of intentions: the direct ones of the author and the refracted ones of the collaborating respondent. The voices and roles are dialogically interrelated. Written exchanges are structured conversationally in mutual respect of each other's knowledge.

When polyphonic form is used in research, as in the novels of Dickens or Dostoevsky, each voice or speaking consciousness is granted as much authority as that of any other. Dialogism offers an alternative model of educational inquiry in which the authority of the mentor and student are equally emphasized. The inquiry can produce a plurality of valid, independent but merging voices, but without any finalizing or totally explanatory word. The voices engage in illuminating but incomplete exchanges, as in the example of the Batesons (1987). A flux of constructions, featuring first and third person voices, singular and plural in number, and of past and present verb tenses, recur throughout our duography.

An In-conclusive Ending

Words like autobiography, biography, and even duography must be prevented "from assuming a force which gives a presence to a centred-life that it cannot have" (Denzin, 1989, p. 46). There can only be multiple versions of any duography of two research lives. We tentatively ask: "How can duography as an arts-based approach help researchers more adequately experience and represent mentorship and co-authorship?" The challenge is to represent the research encounters of two individuals so as to "dramatize the intersubjective give-and-take of fieldwork and introduce a counterpoint of authorial voices" (Clifford, 1988, p. 43). However, we realize that not "everything can be 'said' with anything" (Eisner, 1993, p. 7), not even with duography.

We have tried to listen to the visual voice of our own and each other's imagery and to respond to how we each sculpt narrative text. Like painting and carving, an arts-based form provides the means for expressing the vision and voice of experienced and emerging researchers. Writing partnerships permit the exploration of different episodes involving the same mentoring relationship scrutinized from at least two angles. Bakhtin's (1990) notion of "excess of seeing" indicates that, where the perceptual vision of one person may be marked by clarity, it may also be defined by a corresponding lack of vision of the other. Through reciprocal sharing, greater overall insight is achieved and personal perspective is strengthened.

As mentor and student, we tried to resist generating imposed versions of each other's worldviews. We try to remember that we each look upon the world from a particular standpoint, a particular location in space and time (Greene, 1978). We knew that we risked appropriation whenever we interiorized the other's meanings and presented them as too neatly re-formed and literalized for our own purposes. We tried to listen intently to the other as a way of guarding against reducing his or her beliefs to mere excerpts that served just one set of interests. In duography, the climb involves constantly "monitoring" the perspectives of self and other.

As "intellectual friends," we have used duography in this paper to represent what arts-based mentorship and co-authorship practices have meant to us. We continue "roped together" in our exploration of duography as a new way of negotiating the interpersonal processes of experiencing and knowing. We hope that, through arts-based duography, we can use our various perspectives to examine the mentoring relationship from many different angles. For example, we seek to understand what it means to be in a post-mentoring, faculty relationship with each other. We also seek to understand the relationship between our duographic relationship and our new mentoring contexts with others. As qualitative researchers, we also have designs on others, our readers, because "it is to the role of transformer . . . that writers of qualitative research rightly aspire. As others read [our] story, [we] want them to identify with the problems, worries, joys, and dreams that are the collective human lot" (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992, p. 154).

References

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). The dialogic imagination. (M. Holquist, Ed.), (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1981.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1990). Art and answerability: Early philosophical essays. (M. Holquist & V. Liapunov, Eds.), (V. Liapunov, Trans.). Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.

Barone, T. E. (1983). Things of use and things of beauty: The Swain County high school arts program. Daedalus, 112(3), 1-28.

Barone, T. E. (1993). Ways of being at risk: The case of Billy Charles Barnett. In R. Donmoyer & Kos, R. (Eds.), At-risk students: Portraits, policies, programs, and practices. Albany, New York: SUNY Press.

Barone, T. E., & Eisner, E. W. (1995). Arts-based educational research. In R. Jaeger (Ed.), Complementary methods of educational research. Washington, DC: AERA.

Bateson, G., & Bateson, M. C. (1987). Angels fear: Towards an epistemology of the sacred. New York: MacMillan.

Berthoff, A. G. (1985). Dialectic notebooks and the audit of meaning. In T. Fulwlier (Ed.), The journal book, pp. 11-18. Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Braque, G. (1993). Famous collegial support groups. In D. W. Johnson, R. T., Johnson, & E. J. Holubec (Eds.), Cooperation in the classroom (6th ed.). Edina, Minnesota: Interaction.

Calkins, M. W. (1930). Autobiography. In C. Murchison (Ed.), A history of psychology in autobiography (Vol. 1). Worcester, MA: Clark University Press.

Caplan, P. J. (1994). Lifting a ton of feathers: A woman's guide to surviving in the academic world. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Clandinin, D. J., & Webb, K. (1995, April). Poetry read and exchanged (untitled segment) within "Partners in knowledge: Women mentoring women." Poetry presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Clark, R. W. (1988). School-university relationships: An interpretive review. In K. A. Sirotnik & J. I. Goodlad (Eds.), School-university partnerships in action: Concepts, cases, and concerns (pp. 32-65). New York: Teachers College Press.

Clifford, J. (1988). The predicament of culture: Twentieth-century ethnography, literature, and art. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1988). Narrative meaning: Focus on teacher education. Elements, 19(2), 15-18.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. Educational Researcher, 19(5), 2-14.

Conway, J. K. (1994). True north: A memoir. Toronto: Knopf.

Dentith, S. (1995). Bakhtinian thought. London: Routledge.

Denzin, N. K. (1989). Interpretive biography. New Yorks: Sage.

Denzin, N. K. (1992). The many faces of emotionality: Reading Persona. In C. Ellis & M. G. Flaherty (Eds.), Investigating subjectivity. New York: Sage.

Diamond, C.T.P. (1992). Autoethnographic approaches to teacher education: An essay review. Curriculum Inquiry, 22(1), 67-81.

Diamond, C.T.P. (1993). Writing to reclaim self: The use of narrative in teacher education. Teaching and Teacher Education, 9(5/6), 511-517.

Diamond, C. T. P. (1994). From numbers to words. In Cole, A. L. & Hunt, D. E. (Eds.). The doctoral dissertation journey: Reflections from travellers and guides (pp. 53-60). Toronto: OISE Press.

Diamond, C.T.P. (1995). Education and the narrative of self: Of maps and stories. In Neimeyer, G. J. & Neimeyer, R.A. (Eds.), Advances in personal construct psychology III. Greenwich: JAI Press, (1995).

Eisner, E. W. (1991). The enlightened eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice. New York: Macmillan.

Eisner, E. W. (1993). Forms of understanding and the future of educational research. Educational Researcher, 22(7), 5-11.

Feuerverger, G., & Mullen, C. A. (1995). Portraits of marginalized lives: Stories of literacy and collaboration in school and prison. Interchange, 26(3), 247-265.

Finley, S., & Knowles, J. G. (1995). Researcher as artist/Artist as researcher. Qualitative Inquiry, 1(1), 110-142.

Fishman, A., & Raver, E. J. (1989). "Maybe I'm just NOT English teacher material, dialogue journals in the student teaching experience. English Education, 21(2), 92-109.

Gergen, K., & Gergen, M. (1993). Notes about contributors. In R. Josselson & A. Lieblich (Eds.), The narrative study of lives (pp. 225-226). London: Sage Publications.

Glesne, C., & Peshkin, A. (1992). On becoming qualitative researchers. New York: Longmans.

Grumet, M. (1987). Voice: The search for a feminist rhetoric for educational studies. Cambridge Journal of Education, 20(2), 277-282.

Grumet, M. (1990). Autobiography and reconceptualization. Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 2(2), 155-158.

Greene, M. (1978). The question of personal reality. Teachers College Record, 80, 23-35.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (pp. 105-117). London: Sage Publications.

Hall, R. M. (1983). Academic mentoring for women students and faculty: A new look at an old way to get ahead (Project on the Status and Education of WOMEN). NW: Washington: Association of American Colleges.

Hemingway, E. (1987). The comlete short stories. New York: Collier.

Holly, M. L. (1989, March) . Exploring meanings: Biographical journal writing. Poetry presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Keating, C. N. (1996). An interpretive study of the use of dialogue journals in the professional development of teachers and administrators. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, Toronto.

Kelly, G. A. (1955). The psychology of personal constructs (2nd ed., 1992, London: Routledge, Vols. 1-2). New York: Norton.

Kilbourn, B. (1990). Constructive feedback: Learning the art. Toronto: OISE Press.

Koestler, A. (1964). The act of creation. New York: Dell.

Kozulin, A. (1990). Vygotsy's psychiology: A biography of ideas. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lincoln, Y. S. (1990). Response to "Up from positivism." Harvard Educational Review, 60(4), 508-512.

Lindberg, G. (1985). The journal conference: From dialectic to dialogue. In T. Fulwlier (Ed.), The journal book, pp. 119-128. Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Miezitis, S. (1994). The journey continues: From traveller to guide. In Cole, A. L. & Hunt, D. E. (Eds.). The doctoral dissertation journey: Reflections from travellers and guides (pp. 99-108). Toronto: OISE Press.

Mullen, C. A. (1994a). Imprisoned selves: A narrative inquiry into incarceration and education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, Toronto.

Mullen, C. A. (1994b). A narrative exploration of the self I dream. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 26(3), 253-263.

Mullen, C. A., & Diamond, C. T. P. (1995). Narratives of marginality: From imprisonment to transformation. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Mullen, C. A., & Knowles, J. G. (1995). The art studio: Artist-teacher educators searching for location in the academy. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Mullen, C. A., & Dalton, J. A. (in press). Dancing with sharks: Becoming socialized teacher educator-researchers. Taboo.

Oberg, A. (1990). Methods and meanings in action research: The action research journal. Theory into Practice, 29(3), 214.

Phillips, E. M., & Pugh, D. S. (1994). How to get a PhD: A handbook for students and dissertation supervisors. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Pope, M., & Denicolo, P. (1993). The art and science of constructivist research in teacher thinking. Teaching & Teacher Thinking, 9(5/6), 529-54.

Prince, F. A. (1993). C and the box: A paradigm parable. Toronto: Pfeiffer.

Richardson, L. (1992). The consequences of poetic representation: Writing the other, rewriting the self. In C. Ellis & M. G. Flaherty (Eds.), Investigating subjectivity. New York: Sage Publications.

Salmon, P. (1992). Achieving a PhD—ten students' experiences. Oakhill, Staffordshire: Trentham.

Sarason, S. B. (1990). The predictable failure of educational reform: Can we change course before it's too late? San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Schon, D. (1987). Educating the reflective practitioner. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, D. (1978). A peculiar eclipsing: Women's exclusion from man's culture. Women's Studies International quarterly, 1(4), 281-296.

Spender, D. (1981). The gatekeepers: A feminist critque of academic publishing. In H. Roberst (Ed.), Doing feminist research (pp. 186-202). London: Routlege and Kegan Paul.

Swales, J. W. (1990). Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Voss, M. M. (1988). The light at the end of the journal: A teacher learns about learning. Language Arts, 65(7), 669-674.

Author's Note

The work on which this manuscript is based is supported by a grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.